Comments Received at Workshop No. 2

Participants were asked to comment on key issues identified in Workshop 1 (or bring up new issues) and also to comment on the draft Vision Statement. Their comments follow. In a few cases, John Olaf Nelson Water Resources Management has added clarification. Wherever this was done it is bracketed by <…..>.

STAN GOLD: Representing myself. I have a quick question for clarification about one of the last things that was brought up - some alphabet soup - the IWRP process - where the water budget would be developed between the various sources of the water and the various usages of the water. I thought I heard you say that this determination would be made after the contract was signed. That kind of grabbed my ears. Did you mean that?

RESPONSE BY JOHN NELSON: Yes. Let me repeat that a little bit. I was describing the Integrated Water Resource Planning process, which determines the optimum mix of demand-side and supply-side alternatives. The process for a water system of this size and complexity would cost about a million-dollars. The study can be expected to take a year to a year and a half, maybe a little longer. The existing agreement already sets forth the entitlements for each contractor. These are to the current general plans. An aqueduct expansion project has already been defined. What hasn't been decided yet is exactly when the different elements of the project will be built. There are some elements that may never be built. Now how do you best proceed? Well, you best proceed by optimizing your various sources and I'm recommending that the IWRP process be gone through to determine that. The Agency has done a lot of work already in water conservation. It has also come up with a recycled water project plan and a funding mechanism exits for local standby supply projects, mainly wells that reduce peak summer use. But an overall integrated look that puts all the resources on the table and balances their cost effectiveness against each other as well as environmental impacts - all in one mixing bowl if you will, has not been done. That is what an IWRP does and that's what I'm recommending be undertaken.

STAN GOLD: So you're suggesting a contract be signed without definitive knowledge of water supplies and water usage?

RESPONSE BY JOHN NELSON: We're talking about a new contract. Remember that there is already an existing contract in place. If there is no new contract the existing contract will be in place for the next forty years. We're not starting from scratch. We're talking about a replacement contract for what exists already.

JIM Mc DONALD: A member of the general public. I just wanted to offer a bit of advice that I picked up at the other meeting in Santa Rosa. I was trying to make a point now using the example, and with a sub-group we had here, and pointing out how the Santa Rosa wastewater people had utilized the Laguna as an effective way of getting rid of wastewater, and my point is there's a gold mine of information out here if we can get it out. A fellow from Graton pointed out to me there are some considerations about expanding the Laguna and hurting the habitat of some fish, so I'm sure there's a lot of other issues that we can get expert advice on from all over the auditorium. That was a member of the general public that helped me out on that one.

JOHN BLAYNEY: I'm John Blayney from the Sonoma Valley. The issue that I find missing here is the concept of "carrying capacity" in Sonoma County. The concept of carrying capacity is not addressed in the issues list or the vision statement. Contrary to what Mr. Nelson said, although the Agency may be

willing to leave land use planning to the cities and counties, the State of California is not. It mandates that each local government provide housing capacity in accord with its projections. And the State's current projection for the next 20 years is growth in Sonoma County at a 1.25% compound annual rate. In Mr. Nelson's earlier report <background information report for Workshop 1>, I believe he said projected water demand at 1% compound rate over the next 36 years. Of course I know there could be conservation, but I think where these things all collide is something that needs to be looked at. I realize that it's a long time in the future, you don't have accurate data now, but there should be an attempt to say, "What is the carrying capacity of Sonoma County in terms of known and probable water supply?" Thank you.

ANN MAURICE: My name is Ann Maurice, Ad-Hoc Committee for Clean Water, Sebastopol. I drove here because I missed the other meeting. I've even got laryngitis. So you see how devoted I am and how important this is. I attended the workshop a week from last Monday that was on water issues that was before the Board of Supervisors. I don't know if a lot of people here came to that, but I thought that was a very, very important meeting. I read the staff report for that meeting, and there are issues that were brought up in that staff report which are really important, and I'm glad that the Water Agency has brought them forward. Regarding water quality, it stated an emerging issue was pharmaceuticals and endocrine disrupters potential in the water supply, and that the Agency is flagging this and letting the public know that the EPA is requiring these kinds of compounds to be tested now, and the Water Agency is looking into the ability to monitor for these things. Well, I want to let everybody know that this is an emerging issue for bureaucrats. It is a bureaucratic emerging issue. This has been a problem that has been going on for many years and many of us have been talking about it, and we're glad to see that the agencies are now trying to deal with this. But the public has been trying to flag it for a long time and we're glad to see now that you're finally doing something about it - hopefully. The staff report also mentioned that Collector No. 5, which is near the confluence of Mark West Creek and the Russian River, is influenced by surface flows during high-water flow. Now, if we all turn in the little booklet that we got <background information report from Workshop 1> there's a foldout that shows the water system and there's a blow-up showing exactly where these collector wells are, and the type of collector wells, and they're shallow wells, and if we're not familiar with how our water is collected we ought to be. This is a great map. Thank you for including it. The issue is, and I'm sorry there's not an overlay on top of this, is that these collector wells are right in the middle of extensive vineyard operations and there isn't any discussion in here of agricultural run-off. It amazes me that these vineyards that are in the River, and that's what you really need to call or think of the flood plain of the Russian River as. It is the river - that whole bed, that whole depressed area is the river. Those are not organic vineyards, and it amazes me that we allow these highly toxic chemicals to be used on vineyards in the Russian River upstream from these Ranney collectors, which are shallow—relatively shallow collectors in the river gravel. And we're now talking about pharmaceuticals and endocrine disrupters potentially showing up in the water supply, and the Water Agency is proposing to monitor for these chemicals. The Ad-Hoc Committee for Clean Water, we suggest that rather than monitor for the chemicals, which will, unfortunately show up when it's already too late. We don't want these chemicals to show up in the water supply, that it makes more sense not to be using them. And we're suggesting a proactive approach. People always think in terms of regulation, but I would like to see which vineyard owners, which vineyard organizations, are going to come forward and insist upon their right to use toxic agricultural chemicals in the river, which is a water source for the people of Sonoma and Marin counties. It doesn't make any sense. I can't believe that they would assert that property right if they have it. So maybe on a practical level the Water Agency could engage in a workshop with the Sonoma County grape growers (I can't think of the names of the organizations right off hand) and everybody who is involved with grape growing in the middle reach of the River upstream from these collector wells. Simizine was just banned. I don't know if it was just - but it's been banned in Canada. It's an atrizine-related compound, atrizine-type compound. It is a "notorious" water polluter. It is connected with, suspected connected with, or maybe it's been determined by somebody, but it's good

enough for me to be suspected, causing breast cancer. So it's a suspected or known human carcinogen in use in the Russian River upstream from our water collectors. That makes no sense to me. Also knowing that Marin County, whom the Water Agency serves, has got the highest rate of breast cancer in the world.

The other comment I want to make is that I don't understand how we allow MTBE-spewing engines on Lake Sonoma, which is a reservoir. I don't understand why that isn't banned, how that could possibly be allowed.

On water conservation, the Agency's got terrific educational materials on Xeriscape - they've got tapes, literature - it's fantastic. There needs to be a more aggressive program to distribute this information to people, to make them aware that as soon as they get into California, if not Sonoma County, that they're entering a Mediterranean climatic zone where it doesn't rain in the summertime. And don't watch Martha Stewart. Okay, she's from Connecticut, and it rains in the summer, and all of these pretty plants that she tells you to plant, you know, stressing color and so forth, is depleting the watershed. You know, we're choosing Martha Stewart over salmon. You know this place is dry in the summertime; we should not be pumping ground water in order to water color spot plants that you get from Safeway. And, instead, we need to take heed from all the terrific information that is there already. You don't need to spend any more money, just get it distributed more widely and get us better educated on how to plant native plants. What a fantastic, proactive thing this could be. I think, to Santa Rosa's shame, that there might even be some grass that they're irrigating. And even if they do this with recycled water, it's still irrigating in the summertime and we ought to get rid of that. Sebastopol, the home of all of the supposedly environmentally-minded people have got a little park with irrigated grass in the summer time. That makes no sense either.

And just quickly to thank you for bearing with me, the last comment about vineyard irrigation is really important to consider. I think that the grape growers were bragging that five acres of vineyard is the equivalent of either two or four homes - I forget which one they were saying. Either way, they're saying see, better to have vineyards than two or four houses on every five acres. Well, that begs the question. Whether you like to look at vineyards or you like to look at houses, if they're using that amount of water think of what that would be like as you're driving up 101 past Windsor and Healdsburg and Cloverdale, every five acres that you pass in there, that's two houses you'd know there was a lot of water being used. We're way beyond the water budget; we're way beyond the amount of the re-charge. It makes no sense. We need to get aggressive about requiring these guys to pay attention to the water regime for the rest of the people here. They can grow non-irrigating vines; they don't have to be putting in these shallow-rooted ones for quick-buck returns. The Italians who originally came here planted the vines with the deep-root stocks that went after their own water and didn't require summertime irrigation. Thank you very much.

BILL PHILLIPS: My name is Bill Phillips. I'm from Petaluma, and I'm glad that there are so many professionals and chief negotiators here tonight, especially Tom Hargis from Petaluma, in whom I have great faith I'm happy to say, but there's one thing about the professional arena, and that is you've got to play the deck that the Water Agency is dealing from. I want to call your attention to the proposal for a water ethic, and that deals with a fundamental consideration and overriding policy of water stewardship versus water distribution that must guide the design of Amendment 12 and the construction projects that go with it. I guess I've already indicated my concern about gravel mining. <Earlier during the non-taped segment of the workshop while Mr. Nelson was presenting a recap of Workshop 1 including some of his conclusions and recommendations, Mr. Phillips objected to Mr. Nelson's conclusion that moving jurisdiction for issuing and setting fees for gravel extractions from the County of Sonoma County to the Water Agency was outside the scope of the negotiation process.> I think that the Agency who are the - they are just delivering our water - and that's not their issue. I think that the previous speaker mentioned

some very important issues that are, again, in the arena of a caretaker role for our Water Agency, and it's unfortunate that the Water Agency is governed by a political group that seem to have no interest in the ethic of protecting our water supply. So I have some copies of what I submitted at the first meeting; any of you other wonderful cities that are contractors that are here tonight that would like a copy I have some and you're welcome to look at it <Bill's proposal is included here at end of Bill's comments.>.

I am particularly concerned on behalf of the fish since I'm a fisherman, and I think all of you here tonight saw what happened in Oregon with the Klamath farmers who got cut off because the little minnow was declared endangered. Our fish are going to end up protecting us if the Water Agency doesn't, and when the feds step in and decide you're not going to take 40% more water out and they're looking at the permissiveness of the management of our water system, that it's allowed the damage of gravel mining, and the damage and the ignorance and lack of attention to protecting our water supply, it's going to be tough times. I happen to come from the East and lived in Manhattan, New York, for about ten years, and you can turn on the water there and it's the best water in the world to drink. Comes down from the Ashokan Reservoir. In the East, going back to my prior speaker, there is no boating on the reservoirs; there is no swimming in the reservoirs. That water's protected, and the City of New York and other cities learned, even through they are in a year-round rain zone, that protecting the water has allowed the good life to go on, and growth to go on without the concerns that we have here. We're living in a limited-supply zone and everybody here knows that better than I do because I've only lived here for six years, but we really have to start looking at a structure, and I hope that my remarks are being recorded and there is some concern on the part of the Water Agency itself, that they can't just live in a zone where "hey, that's not my problem, Mac." Thank you very much.

"PROPOSAL FOR THE CONTRACTORS AND SCWA TO ADOPT
THE POSTURE OF WATER STEWARDSHIP

It is essential that the contractors of SCWA begin the process of permanent, responsible water management and conservation immediately. An overriding policy of water stewardship versus water distribution must guide the design of Amendment 12's construction projects. Furthermore, recycling, reuse and recharge systems must be an integral component of those construction projects. In interest of the above, the community requires the following items be added to Amendment 12:

1. A Water Ethic.

We, the contractors of SCWA, recognize that as consumers of Sonoma County's water resources, we have an obligation to ensure that those resources remain available in perpetuity for future generations.

2. A Charter of Stewardship.

We charter the SCW A to be the steward of our County's water resources, rather than a water utility. It is charged with implementing water management and conservation systems that allow us to live by our Water Ethic.

3. A Water Conservation Plan.

We the contractors of SCW A wish to enable the County to reclaim water at the following rate of increasing return:

Year Percentage of Water Obtained from Reuse, Recycling and Groundwater Recharge.

2001	2%
2002	5%
2003	7.5%
2004	10%
2005	12.5%
2006	15%
2007	20%
2008	24%
2009	28%
2010	30%"

DAVID KELLER: Former council member, City of Petaluma, and board member of Friends of the Eel River. Thank you John, and thank you to the WAC members for doing this series again. It's very important to get to some of the larger issues that were not covered by Amendment 11. When I sat on the Council, we were told, well, we'll deal with that with Amendment 12. Well, this is Amendment 12, or a new water supply agreement, so it really does mean that we have the opportunity to take on the larger issues and not just drive the same train down the same tracks with different colored cars. And that's important to me, John, when you say that there are several issues that are just off the table that are deleted. That concerns me a great deal. The governance issue is one that will not go away.

Is there anybody in this room other than from Sonoma or Marin County? <Guest Speaker Jim Fiedler rose.> What County? Santa Clara County. Thank you. Nobody from the watershed, nobody from further up the watershed for the Russian or Eel River is here. There are stake holders who are not represented and yet who will have a very, very strong hand in determining what our water supply looks like for the future, what it's going to cost, and how reliable it's going to be for how many people. We talked about the carrying capacity of the land; we need to talk about the carrying capacity of the watersheds - that's the Russian and the Eel River. For the Eel River the counties of concern are Humboldt, upper Mendocino, Lake County. Those counties, Humboldt County just recently turned down a FERC proposal on water agreement through the Potter Valley Project saying that it was not supplying sufficient water. They are going to become a more and more active role. There are Indian tribes, there's the Forest Service, there's a number of agencies, chambers of commerce, all who have said about the North Coast Rivers, particularly the Eel, we want our water back - we're going to get it. What does Kendall-Jackson know that we don't that they are now trying to sign an agreement for more water that doesn't depend on the Russian River? They know what the future supply is going to be. Why are we acting as if that stuff doesn't exist? We don't have the water rights to the water through the Potter Valley Project. We don't have the water rights for additional withdrawals from Warm Springs. Both of those are under legal challenges by a consortium of groups, and unless we start talking about these bigger issues, we're really headed down another path of continuing doing the same old stuff that's going to wind up being very expensive because it won't succeed.

Now the object here is how to get reliable water supply for all populations at a reliable cost, doing minimal environmental damage, if not improving the environment, and making it possible for our populations and our economies to continue to grow. And that doesn't mean, as we have been doing silently for the past 90 years, transferring wealth from those North Coast Counties to feed the development of capital wealth in Marin and Sonoma County, because that's what the transfer of the Eel River has been. It has been a direct transfer of wealth. Well, that's not to continue going for free and it may not continue at all. We have to deal with those questions. Those stakeholders have not been invited to any of these meetings. <John Nelson noted over 4600 invitations were sent out including all the water districts and government agencies and many of the other stakeholders in the northern counties.> Well, they're not here, so that means that the outreach is not working. When you say let's not deal with the

governance of the Water Agency, the governance of the Water Agency means how do you get those stakeholders into this discussion. It's not easy, it's complicated, it's multi-layered, it's convoluted, it's conflicting. All of that being said, it's nevertheless necessary. And to shirk your duty as elected officers and as water supply managers for your customers means that you're setting it up for future surprise expenses. To say, well we'll worry about what NMFS says later, and what Humboldt County says later, and what Lake County says later, you're setting it up for failure. You have to include that stuff now. The governance of the Water Agency is a critical piece of that because nobody outside of Sonoma County can vote for the people who are controlling this water supply.

Limiting the growth by other than general plan dictates, well general plans, as we all know, have a water component to them. Well, guess where those numbers come from? They come from the Water Agency. We all come up with urban water management plans from numbers that are based on numbers supplied from the Water Agency, so you have this little charade going on where the decision makers at the local level say well we can plan on this in the general plan because the Water Agency says that's the numbers we can work with. And the Water Agency says we don't have to deal with anything other than the general plans because they've made their own predictions. It doesn't work that way. Questions about carrying capacity, about sustainability, have to be part of this discussion. And those are not included in general plan dictates currently.

The decision on gravel mining permits and fees, obviously gravel mining is affecting the aquifer. And unless the water suppliers on the local level who have to deal with your customers who come to you - they don't go to the Water Agency. When you charge your customers rates, and raise those rates, or say there's a water shortage, they don't go to the Water Agency, they don't complain to the Board of Sups; they complain to you. And so you've got to deal with what the water quality is and what the water supply reliability is, and those are embedded in those gravel mining permits and fees. Currently, no cost is included in gravel mining fees for the loss of filtration and storage capacity which is the very function of that gravel itself. It's a free ride. The value of that gravel is not just the construction material; it's its ability to filter water and to store water, and that storage is the summertime flow, which is what we're all talking about. We're talking about how you address peak flows during the dry period. Well, the summertime flows is where that water comes from, and that's held, captured, stored and released by the gravel. Lose the gravel, lose the summer storage, and that's why Kendall-Jackson is being very smart about it. Why aren't we being smart?

You say that flood control, again not an issue for us to deal with in terms of permits and operations. Well, how that flood control is done affects the water quality and affects the supply. If flood control is done by a policy of removing gravel and lowering the riverbed, you're removing storage and filtration capacity. And the Board of Sups, wearing one hat as the directors in control of development, and another hat as the directors in control of water supply, is in contradiction, and those issues don't get aired at the Board of Sups, they don't get discussed, and it's usually washed over, I'm sorry to say, with money. And that's my reasoning why the Board of Sups should not be the directors of this Water Agency. There are too many conflicts in their roles, and they can't pay attention to this. Even if there's no money involved, there's just no way for them to do it reasonably. It's one of only what, two or three in the state that are governed co-equally by the Board of Sups. It's time for a change.

In terms of the presentation on the vision statement, again, it's very nice - it's got the warm fuzzies in there - but it's missing some very important pieces, operational pieces. And this goes to the overall picture if, in my mind is, we really need to take on the task of watershed management for potable water supply forever. Civilizations come and go over water supply; it's not anything new, and we've only been at this now for 50 years. The Water Agency has only been around for 52 years. Big deal. Are we going to support this population for another 10 years, 20 years, 50 years, 100 years? How about 500 years? How about 1,000 years? How about 2000 years? They've been doing it in other parts of the world. And

when they've failed to do it those civilizations and those economies die. No water, no population, no economy. And that water has to be clean and reliable, and that's our job. That's really the gift of doing this amendment 11 is to take on that issue and say, how are we going to manage this watershed, our water supply, surface water, ground water? How are we going to manage it forever? And once you take that as the mandate and the perspective, then the questions about the inflows come into place. Then the questions about the gravel extraction come into place. Then the questions about the hillside logging practices, the erosion, the urbanization in the watershed - all of that comes into place because your objective is to make sure your customers, and their children, and their children, and their children, and their children have a reliable water supply forever. And it's a different task than what we're doing. We're playing the same old game right here and it's not going to work.

Fortunately, there are other models around the world that do work, and I keep raising the New York City model as one that I think we need to look at very closely. New York was told by EPA to filter their water system. 140 years of unfiltered water serving 9,000,000 people from five upstate counties. Unfiltered - the only thing they'd have to do is chlorinate it. It's a surface water system; it's not even an aquifer system. And EPA said about ten years ago, filter it. It's a six billion dollar proposition for New York City. And New York City went through a very careful analysis of what choice they're going to make. Ultimately they decided that watershed management for potable water supply is the way to go. For under a billion dollars they're doing that program. It's a land stewardship program, it's a technical assistance program, it's a buy-out of important corridors in their watershed on a voluntary basis. It involves septic tank maintenance, replacement - all inflows from wastewater treatment, whether it's individual septic tanks or from wastewater treatment plants - none of that can go into surface water. They've been improving the quality requirements on discharges from those plants to quaternary, not tertiary. There's a residence time required before it can be discharged into any surface water impoundment or any surface water stream. Also, very different approach to land management. Working with road departments, working with urbanization, working with the cities and counties on a voluntary basis. New York City ratepayers are footing the bill. It will cost them under a billion dollars - a sixth of what the treatment plant would have cost. And what they're working toward is a strategy and a plan to ensure their watershed's health and the economies within that watershed forever, because that's their task. And I'll finish up here very quickly. That's our opportunity.

If we shift our focus to making sure that we have water supply through a healthy watershed, the fisheries questions will also be addressed, because if you have a healthy watershed you'd have healthy fish populations. The erosion questions, the inflows, all of the toxics that are coming in - the fact that we're discharging wastewater above our intakes and increasing that amount is crazy. You can't expect a civilization to do that. You know that water treatment plants don't remove that chemistry. You know that. So why continue in that direction? Let's set a path for managing the watershed as if our lives, and our grandchildren's, and our great grandchildren's lives depended on it, because it does. And at the same time, we end up with a healthier economy, a healthier environment, and a reliable water supply. And I think that's really the focus that we need to shift on, and if we just play this nickel and dime and say well, what do we have to do get away with this next round of agreements, because I know water system managers - just give me the water, I want to deliver it to my customers, and skip the rest of this nonsense. And these are public policy questions that have to be addressed by elected public policy officials, because water system management is not their job, and water system management as your job as managers doesn't necessarily reflect the need to take into account all of this. And it doesn't mean that I'm demeaning that in any way at all. I'm not an engineer and I can't run those plants; you can. But there's something we have to look at about what goes into those plants, and that's the opportunity that we have here and I don't want to see us missing it. Thank you.

JOHN ROSENBLUM: I'm John Rosenblum. I'm from Sebastopol. I'm an engineer, so what I'm going to say is first of all about the participation of the public, and second of all some technical stuff. First of all, we live in an environment that is a limiting factor. Without the environment we won't have an economy, and without an economy we won't have anything for ourselves. So, what David has said, and what Ann has said, is extremely important in setting what the vision is, and we can't exclude any conversation about the vision and the political issues around the vision from that conversation. As an engineer, the issue is, can we address these issues within that framework? So on the participation level, it's extremely important to create, as David mentioned, enough incentive for people to come and discuss these issues, and enough incentive for those who have to manage the water system to listen and accommodate those interests.

Okay, so now, dealing with a little technical issue that I had, and that was on the financing. What's missing from the list of key issues identified is maybe an item 17A, which is financial equity in the funding of alternatives. And what I mean there is using an adequate amount of budget - let's put it that way - money, that will look at water efficiency, water reuse, water recycling, not just water reclamation. Using wastewater after it's gone through the wastewater treatment plant - the municipal wastewater treatment plant - isn't as cost effective as recycling that water at its source. For example, we don't have any here, but a semi-conductor plant, or a food processing plant - we have a lot of those: dairies. There's lots of opportunities to recycle directly at the source of use. But because there's some kind of, for some reason I don't understand yet, there's only 6,600 acre feet per year anticipated in the new plan to be included as conservation. We're not looking at a wide enough scope in those alternatives. And in order to go more than 6,600 acre-feet a year, we have to spend enough money to evaluate the cost effectiveness. So all I'm asking for right now is while you're deliberating this agreement is to allocate enough money to find out whether you can go further than 6,600 acre feet per year of conservation. Thanks.

NED ORRETT: Good evening, I'm Ned Orrett from Petaluma, representing myself, and thank you for this opportunity. And thank you, John, and others, for posting all this stuff ahead of time on the web so that we could read it. I would like to try to concentrate my comments and address the draft vision statement. I feel that's probably the most important place to concentrate, because all the comments I see reflect the vision as it stands right now. First of all, the vision embodies intentions I feel are healthy and I wish to support them. As for specific comments; three main areas here.

The vision appears to assume that it will always be possible to serve all human and watershed needs adequately. I believe this is possible, but only if we really put effort into rethinking our collective roles and responsibilities. Without that, it's sort of hopeful but I don't think we can do it.

The first sentence of the vision begins: "Guided by the principle of sustainability…" I find this a wonderful beginning because it acknowledges, for me, that we're beginning to become aware of our principal challenge as a species on the planet, which is to, it's this, it's to keep the scale of our global economy small enough to fit within the biosphere. In other words, I see this as more than just a local carrying capacity issue. Anyone who's looking at sustainability seriously now in the world today understands this is a global issue. The water, of course, is local, but beyond that everything water touches carries us quickly into all the other systems. The draft vision describes sustainability within the perspective of just water issues, should we not remember that sustainability embraces the entire biosphere and our place within it? This important distinction will help us to better understand aspects of water planning that bear on other resources.

My third point gets to the first bullet of the draft mission, which declares that the objective of providing a reliable, safe and adequate water supply. But we all know that the growth of human development that

we're seeing and the objective of an environmental legacy, it is going to become increasingly difficult to reconcile these competing desires. So, should we not consciously begin with this new agreement a reconciliation of those competing desires? We all know it's there but we haven't explicitly addressed it unless I'm reading this incorrectly, which could easily be the case. So in terms of reconciliation, I have two suggestions. One is that we introduce the concept of providing not just water, but also services that accomplish what water alone can do. In other words, growth and water use are not joined at the hip; they can be treated independently with our imagination and our analysis. The second point is to consider establishing a dialogue between those who demand resources and those who are currently bound to act on those demands. Again, there's this underpinning of conflict that is just crying out to be addressed, and addressed up front in a creative manner. So that's why I'm suggesting dialogue. Is this not a time to create intentional feedback groups and learning possibilities?

And now if I sound like I'm from outer space I'll hang around a little bit longer. But to help prevent that entirely, I'd like to refer, as an example, to what Interface Corporation is doing. They are - it's a billion dollar company in the business of floor coverings. Now it is not a water agency, I agree, but they are arguably the world's leader on learning how to deal with sustainability. I'll read just five of their seven points how they're going to do this. First, is eliminate waste; they may not just incrementally reducing waste, but eliminate the entire concept of waste. Two: benign emissions. That is, they're going to focus on the elimination of molecular waste emissions - that's stuff like carbon dioxide and the things that Ann Maurice was talking about. Renewable energy: This company is going to reduce the energy demands, they say, Interface processes, while substituting non-renewable sources with sustainable ones. They're doing that right now. This goes to dialogue. Number 6, their sensitivity hook-up: They intend to create a community within and around Interface that understands the functioning of natural systems and our impact on them. And, finally, they're going to redesign commerce, as we might redesign water utility. They're going to redesign commerce to focus on the delivery of service and value instead of material, encouraging external organizations to create policies and market incentives promoting sustainable practices. Thank you very much.

BILL KORTUM: I'm Bill Kortum. I'm speaking for myself. A long-term observer of Sonoma County and its water battles. I attended a meeting that John Nelson was conducting and he was talking about cites having to have drought emergency plans, and I remember the occasion that Brenda Adelman was in the back of the room and she raised her hand and said, "John, what do you do about the new hook-ups during a drought emergency plan?" John said, "Well, those industries, or those developers, or those new users of water have to go out and retrofit enough houses to find enough water for their use." And it sounded to me like why do we have to wait for a drought for that to happen. And with a little more research, I understand that Santa Monica does just that.

Now Sonoma County is asking for 8 billion gallons of water from the Russian River in its new allotment in the next ten years. Added all right now those four main cities of Sonoma County will need 4 billion gallons of that allotment. I did some work, because I was interested in wastewater, of the outside irrigation in those four cities in the suburban and industrial area. And guess what? That's 4 billion gallons. So if you put your thinking caps on, we don't have to build any pipelines if we retrofit what we already have. It's a new supply of water. It's like building a new dam for 4 billion gallons of water and tapping into it. And maybe we don't have to make every new arrival pay the full share because, having that supply of water, there's no reason the contractors can't help in that retrofitting process. John says it costs about $2,500 to retrofit a house, if I remember right. <$2,500 to install enough conservation in existing development to offset inside use of typical single family home and about double that to offset inside + outside demand of typical single family home>,. I think we should seriously look into and consider that.

I want to talk about groundwater, and I did do the homework, John. I studied what came out of the last session. I wasn't able to be there but you did make the statement that the contractors shouldn't have to pay for a Sonoma County groundwater study. Yeah, I'll show you the page. And my thinking is, when I was on the Board of Supervisors, a specific plan came along, the Harrison Grade Plan. And it was the first time the County looked in an area and said it has a carrying capacity based on the shortage of water. And we came up with the specific plan for Harrison Grade that said just so many houses can go into Harrison Grade. Now what will happen out there you'll never have what we've observed all over the County when we over-tap our groundwater, we get a drought, there's panic, and who do they come to? They come to the Sonoma County Water Agency for a pipeline. I can't give you an example, but that's what's going to happen. So what does that do to the total water supply? It opens up that possibility because every taxpayer in this County is paying for Warm Springs' construction. They have a right to come in and want that pipeline, so that's the connection between land use and water, and we should do a total groundwater study of this County, and it should be paid for by the ratepayers because that's a real threat to the future water supply in this County because we should be able to control how many houses go up in that countryside, based on the groundwater.

And the third thing I'd like to talk about, just briefly, is urban wastewater. Santa Rosa runs its water up to the Geysers, which I think is a disaster for an agricultural county to ship its water for producing electricity. This is an agricultural county, it's not a power-generating county, and we needed that water for agriculture, particularly the Central County and South County. By so doing, there's not enough wastewater left over to do an urban water project in Santa Rosa because of summertime flow demands. But the main thing I'd like to leave you with, and the engineers in this room know this already; is, if do we use wastewater to take care of, by the proper engineering, the peak flow times - those critical ten or fifteen days in the summertime. Right now we have to build $25 million worth of steel tank construction to take care of that peak flow. If you go to Ed Grossi, he can "store" wastewater <via irrigation> for 2-1/2 cents per gallon. Those steel tanks on the hill cost $1.00-$1.20 cents a gallon to build. What a beautiful way to take care of your peak flow without going to $25 million worth of investment.

PAM TORLIATT: My name is Pam Torliatt. I'm a Petaluma City Council member. And a couple of the issues, or questions that I have, is verification of information. I would like to have a quantified and verified the resources for the existing commitments that the Sonoma County Water Agency has, to supply to all of its contractors - not just the existing WAC members. I'd like to have that information provided. I'd also like to have provided a current status and monthly updates to the water contractors of implementation of the existing master agreement and all of the amendments - only on on-going projects at this point in time. The eleventh amended agreement included projects and financing tools, such as financing additions to the existing transmission system, scheduling of additions and replacements for the existing transmission system, further modifications to the transmission system, the Potter Valley project, water conservation measures, and operation and maintenance, to name a few. So I think it's imperative for us to understand exactly what's going on at this point in time so we can track what is supposed to be going on in the future. I would also like to know what the finite amount of water is that the Water Agency can provide to its contractors in the interim. There's got to be, or I mean in the infinite, because there's got to be a finite number on the amount of water that we can actually pull out of that River. And I'd like to know what that number is. Somebody's got to know it, and somebody's got to know approximately what it is. And then from there we can always work with looking at other sources of recycling and conservation measures.

I also believe that it's important that we have a watershed management plan, and I don't know if it can be part of this agreement, but I think it's a commitment that we need to have from the Water Agency in order to identify a lot of these issues that the previous speakers have been talking about.

I also believe that it is important that we have a groundwater study, and I'm glad that the previous speaker spoke to that because we need to make sure that we know how much groundwater is available, the scarce areas are replenished, and so we have a sustainable water supply for this entire County. If we put too many straws out and we don't put enough water back into the system, we're going to run out of water. We will. At this time, I'll move to the next speaker. Thank you.

GEORGE AMAROLI: I'm George Amaroli and I've been a director of North Marin for 32 years, and we've had the honor of having John Nelson work with us, and John Nelson launched our conservation programs in the early 1970's. I want to tell you they're cost effective, they bring back more results than it costs us to run them, and we started primarily with new construction. And John really hit it hard. And for those of you who want to start something on water conservation, remember we pay cash for grass. And if you want to eliminate your peak demand you've got to get rid of that turf. And if you don't understand it, I want you to talk to the dean of "cash for grass" and that's John Nelson.

A lot of you are talking about wastewater recycling, and John's got the wrong numbers in these reports. The average cost for recycled water when you have parallel lines, and extra water tanks, and separate systems, is about $3,000 an acre-foot. And, of course, the people who are using it are not paying that. Now the only way to get recycled wastewater that works is in a project like Santa Rosa's. They already built the pipeline. It's going up to the Geysers, and you have all those vineyards between Santa Rosa and the Geysers. Now some of the environmentalist groups are opposed to using that on vineyards. I don't know why. Frankly, you can shepherd that very well and do it safely. But I would ask those environmentalists to look very carefully at that, because if you put - and John's statement of what we're using on vineyards is incredibly low. What you really need to see some day is overhead sprinkling of 160 acres of vineyard simultaneously. These farmers - and you're talking economics - somebody says you ought to dry farm. Yeah, you can get 2 to 3 tons to the acre, maybe, maximum, if you dry farm. But they're looking for more like 6, 7, and more tons to the acre. It's an economic thing, so they're applying water. My suggestion is that we make maximum use of that Santa Rosa wastewater. It's a one-line system; it's not a duplicate system. The farmers will participate in the costs and leave water in the River.

Now there's another tremendous resource that environmentalists didn't want us to have, and they fought us on, but we completed it in 1983. That resource is Warm Springs Dam. It is an incredible resource. At the end of October in any given year, the low ebb in Warm Springs is about 207,000 acre-feet of water. And I'm talking about the low ebb. You know that we had rains in November - it's already above that level. And it's time that we started productively using the Warm Springs resource. W completed it in 1983, and we're running a fish hatchery and in-stream uses, and letting the farmers suck a little bit for the vineyards until you get down beyond Healdsburg and so forth.

There are all kinds of water resources, and there are all kinds of water needs. They should all be looked at cost effectively, and you don't pay more than what you need to in order to get the water that you need to serve the public. If we operate these resources properly, and we do proper conservation in a cost-effective manner, we will have the lowest cost and the public will be very well served. And the environmentalists will see that this County will do a reasonable job. You've got a deck of things to look at that is massive. When I first joined the Board in 1969, if we needed to drill three emergency wells at the River - and the Agency didn't have the money in 1972 - North Marin loaned them the money. And in 90 days those wells were in. It will take a couple of years to get this document together, but I urge you to look at all the available resources and all the needs, and use your least-cost approach to serve the people in the best way possible. Thanks very much.

The Following Comments Were Submitted on 3 X 5 Cards:

TARA TREASUREFIELD:

1. Your "dot" system concerns me. If your purpose is to identify most critical issues, they are all critical.
2. Board of Supervisors as Water Agency is a conflict of interest, inappropriate.
3. Long term planning, from now to forever, is essential. You aren't doing that now, so we are doomed.

JOHN MURPHY, Sonoma Citizen

1. What role does SCWA play in management, conservation and/or replenishment of water used by entities not served by aqueduct water?
2. What percentage of water used in Sonoma County is not delivered by the various Cities and Districts?
3. Concerned about groundwater, especially in Sonoma Valley.
4. Supports Integrated Water Resource Plan approach.